

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | 4:15CR3078 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | MEMORANDUM |
| v. |) | AND ORDER |
| |) | |
| CLIFF HUDSON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

On February 19, 2016, Magistrate Judge Cheryl R. Zwart made certain findings of fact and recommended that Defendant's motion to suppress (Filing No. [61](#)) be denied (Filing No. [116](#)). Generally stated, Judge Zwart concluded that Defendant did not have a reasonable expectation of privacy in historical cell-site data and subscriber information that authorities obtained by serving a total of six search warrants on three different cell phone service providers.

On March 18, 2016, after being granted an extension of time, Defendant filed a statement of objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation (Filing No. [128](#)). The government responded on March 24, 2016 (Filing No. [131](#)).

I have conducted a de novo review of the record. I find that inasmuch as Judge Zwart has fully, carefully, and correctly found the facts and applied the law, the findings and recommendation should be adopted, the statement of objections should be denied, and the motion to suppress should be denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendation (Filing No. [116](#)) are adopted.
2. Defendant's statement of objections (Filing No. [128](#)) is denied.
3. Defendant's motion to suppress (Filing No. [61](#)) is denied.

DATED this 1st day of April, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge